



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/903,838

07/11/2001

Richard E. Fangman

5686-00300

2194

7590

04/15/2009

Rory D. Rankin

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC

P.O. Box 398

Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2419

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/903,838	Applicant(s) FANGMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Andrew C. Lee	Art Unit 2419	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 3/23/2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: _____.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
 See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Edan Orgad/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 1, applicant argues not all features of the presently claimed invention are disclosed or suggested by the cited references, taken either alone or in combination. "receiving an identifier from the IP telephone; determining if a MAC ID for the IP telephone is valid; if the MAC ID is determined to be valid, determining if the identifier is valid; Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner contends the combined system of references Lee et al. (US 6958992 B2) in view of Schuster et al. (US 6822957 B1) disclose the claimed subject matters of "receiving an identifier from the IP telephone; determining if a MAC ID for the IP telephone is valid; if the MAC ID is determined to be valid, determining if the identifier is valid.

Examiner interpreted receiving an identifier from the IP telephone as element 320, Service Provider ID, see Lee et al., Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 23 - 32, here an identifier from the IP telephone is the vender ID (see applicant's specification, page 5, and pages 35 - 36) which is interpreted as service provider ID; and interpreted determining if the identifier is valid as checks the information against its lookup table of data shared with OAM, that is Svc Provider ID, MAC. Set Type, Port etc information during the open port set registration process, see Lee et al., Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 33 - 39; interpreted as determining if a MAC ID for the IP telephone is valid as checks the information against its lookup table of data shared with OAM,.....The OAM upon receipt of the validation request... see Lee et al., Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 33 - 39, 47 - 55; if the MAC ID is determined to be valid, determining if the identifier is valid, see Lee et al, Fig. 4, col. 3, lines 47 - 55, col. 4, lines 12 - 24, col. 6, lines 14 - 26. The above claimed subject matter "receiving an identifier from the IP telephone" is merely a vendor ID assigned to the IP phone by DHCP, if IP phone using different vendor or service provider, the IP Phone vender ID/Service Provider ID will also be changed according to how the DHCP server be setup; however, on the other hand, the MAC ID/address of the IP phone is unique. It is known that every MAC ID/MAC address in the world is unique. Different IP phones from different manufactures have different MAC ID. The claimed subject matters "determining if a MAC ID for the IP telephone is valid; if the MAC ID is determined to be valid, determining if the identifier is valid" as the registration procedures of the IP phone before the talkpath is being established. The limitations are disclosed clearly in Fig. 3, Fig.4 of reference Lee et al., see col. 3, lines 33 - 65, and col. 4, lines 17 - 67.

Regarding claim 60, applicant then argues reference Edholm does not disclose or suggest at least the features "perform network address translation (NAT) on the first data packet with a second private IP address, the second private IP address being assigned by a service provider." Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner contends reference Edholm suggest "perform network address translation (NAT) on the first data packet with a second private IP address, the second private IP address being assigned by a service provider"

Examiner interpreted perform network address translation (NAT) on the first data packet with a second private IP address, the second private IP address being assigned by a service provider as permits multiple private addresses to be mapped, see Edholm, col. 4, lines 56 - 66, col. 5, lines 1 - 21, col. 6, line 67, col. 7, lines 1 - 12..